REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6 and 8-11 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 11 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

Before turning to the cited references, a brief review of the actual procedure for correcting transaction data in the present invention is described below.

The POS terminal A of the present invention performs the correction of data regarding transaction (B), which occurred at POS terminal B and is registered in the transaction log file of POS terminal B as follows:

First, POS terminal A requests the store server to send the data regarding transaction (B). Once POS terminal A receives the data regarding transaction (B) from the store server, POS terminal A performs the correction of data regarding transaction (B) and stores the corrected data in its transaction log file as transaction data relating to a new transaction (A) that occurred at POS terminal A.

At the same time, POS terminal A sends the corrected data to the store server as transaction data relating to the new transaction (A) that occurred at POS terminal A. Upon reception of the corrected data sent by POS terminal A, the store server stores the corrected data as transaction data relating to the new transaction (A) that occurred at POS terminal A.

In the meantime, POS terminal A sends transaction cancellation instructions to the store server to cancel the data regarding transaction (B) stored in the store server. The store server then sends a transaction cancellation instruction to POS terminal B to cancel the data relating to

transaction (B).

As a result, transaction (B) that occurred in POS terminal B is canceled out by POS terminal A and new transaction (A) containing the corrected data is stored in both of POS terminal A and the store server.

As mentioned above, in the present invention, POS terminal A does not transmit the corrected transaction data to the originating POS terminal B through the store server. Rather, POS terminal A transfers transaction cancellation instruction regarding transaction (B) to POS terminal B via the store server.

Claims 1, 4-6 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over **Rogers et al.** in view of **Houvener et al.** (both previously applied).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner has urged that **Rogers et al.** discloses that "one POS (other than the POS at which the transaction occurred) may cancel a transaction performed at another POS terminal" by referring to col. 4, lines 5-12.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Regarding the description in col. 4, lines 5-12 of **Rogers et al.**, the Examiner incorrectly assumes that operator terminal 12 shown in FIG. 1 represents one POS terminal other than the POS terminal at which the transaction occurred in the present invention.

Operator terminal 12 of **Rogers et al.** is not the POS terminal specified by the present invention. Each POS terminal of the present invention has means for inputting transaction data

and means for storing the transaction data as transaction data relating to a transaction that occurred at its own POS terminal. It is apparent that operator terminal 12 of **Rogers et al.** does not have such means. In addition, the specification of **Rogers et al.** fails to disclose that POS terminal 2 has means for storing the transaction data inputted therein as transaction data relating to a transaction that occurred at its own POS terminal.

The Examiner further states on page 3, lines 12-13 of the Office Action that **Rogers et al.** discloses that the store server (local computer system 6) transfers the transaction cancel instruction to the POS terminal at which the transaction occurred, by referring to col. 4, lines 30-45. However, **Rogers et al.** fails to disclose that local computer system 6 (shown in FIG. 1) sends a transaction cancel instruction to POS terminal 2. As mentioned above, POS terminal 2 of **Rogers et al.** does not have means for storing transaction data inputted therein, and therefore, it is not necessary for the local computer system 6 to send a transaction cancel instruction to POS terminal 2 so as to cancel the data stored in POS terminal 2.

As mentioned above, there is a fundamental distinction between the POS terminal of the present invention and that of **Rogers et al.** in that the POS terminal of the present invention has means for storing transaction data which relates to a transaction that occurred therein, while the POS terminal of **Rogers et al.** does not have this capability.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

A telephonic interview was conducted with the Examiner on April 25, 2007 to discuss the patentability of the claims. The Examiner noted that **Rogers et al.** discloses that a transaction

may be canceled at a POS other than the POS which initiated it. No agreement was reached.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1, 4-6 and 8-11, as amended, are in condition for further examination.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak
Atty. Docket No. **011375**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Request for Continued Examination Transmittal
Check in the amount of $790.00

Q:\HOME\AKERR\WLB\01\011375\amendment af may 2007